

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 6-11, 13-16 and 19-24 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 11, 16, 19 and 23 have been amended. Claim 2, 4-5, 12 and 18 are canceled. Claim 24 is added as new. Support for the foregoing claim amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during a telephonic interview conducted on May 7, 2010. During the interview, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the proposed amendments. The Examiner agreed that the amended claims 1, 3, 6-11, 13-16, 19 and 23 as shown herein overcame the current rejections under 35 USC § 112. The Examiner further requested that Applicant clarify claim 24.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 3 and 16 are objected to for certain informalities.

In response to item a), Applicant has amended claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner.

In response to item b), Applicant has amended claim 16 to depend from claim 11.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In response to items a) and e), the feature of “a mapping relation between address information of multicast users and multicast authorities” in claim 1 is amended to “a first mapping relation between address information of multicast users and multicast authorities”, and the feature of “a mapping relation between multicast authorities and multicast group addresses in a network equipment” in claim 1 is amended to “a second mapping relation between multicast authorities and multicast group addresses in a network equipment.”

In response to item b), the “multicast user” in “obtaining a request packet sent by a multicast user who requests to join in a multicast group to use a multicast service” and subsequent steps of claim 1 is amended to “given multicast user.”

In response to item c), the feature of “determining whether the multicast user corresponds to a multicast authority according to the mapping relation between address information of multicast users and multicast authorities as well as the address information of the multicast user” is amended to “using the address information of the given multicast user to determine whether the given multicast user corresponds to a multicast authority according to the first mapping relation.”

In response to item d), the feature of “if the multicast user corresponds a multicast authority and the multicast group address carried in the request packet matches a multicast group address corresponding to the multicast authority of the

multicast user among the mapping relation between multicast authorities and multicast group addresses” is amended to “if the given multicast user corresponds to a multicast authority and the multicast group address carried in the request packet matches a multicast group address corresponding to the multicast authority of the given multicast user.”

In response to items f) and g), as suggested by the Examiner, the feature of “wherein the step of presetting mapping relations comprises presetting a second mapping relation” in claim 11 is amended to “wherein the step of presetting mapping relations further comprises presetting a second mapping relation.”

In response to items h) and i), claim 17 has been cancelled and claims 19, 20, and 23 have been amended to depend from the new claim 24.

Further, the “multicast user” in claim 11 is amended to “given multicast user”.

NEW CLAIMS

Claim 24 is added as new. Applicant respectfully submits that the new claim 24 defines a particular Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) broadband access equipment, which is capable of communicating with user equipments of multicast users. A DSL broadband access equipment is a network equipment with sufficient processing power, memory resources, and network throughput capability to handle the necessary workload. Thus, various elements or components may be combined or integrated in the DSL broadband access equipment to perform the functions recited in the body of the claim.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 11, 2010

By: /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/PFD/tlp

15466423.3